

**Economic Advisory Group &
Stakeholder Workshops
Lansing, Detroit, Grand Rapids,
Marquette, & Grayling, Michigan
June 22-28, 2006
Meeting Summary**

*Michigan Department of Transportation
State Long-Range Transportation Plan
2005 - 2030*



**Prepared for
The Michigan Department
of Transportation**

September 20, 2006

Prepared by:

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Overview	1
Chapter 2. What works?	3
2.1 Economic Advisory Group	3
2.2 Stakeholder Meetings	3
2.2.1 Detroit	3
2.2.2 Marquette	4
2.2.3 Grand Rapids	4
2.2.4 Grayling	5
Chapter 3. Common Themes: What works?	5
3.1 Funding/Financing	5
3.2 Freight	7
3.3 Innovation/Research	7
3.4 Land Use	7
3.5 Multi-modal/Integration	7
Chapter 4. What does not work?	6
4.1 Economic Advisory Group	6
4.2 Stakeholder Workshops	6
4.2.1 Detroit	6
4.2.2 Marquette	7
4.2.3 Grand Rapids	7
4.2.4 Grayling	8
Chapter 5. Common Themes: What does not work?	8
5.1 Funding/Financing	8
5.2 Freight	8
5.3 Innovation/Research	8
5.4 Land Use	8
5.5 Multi-modal/Integration	7
Chapter 6. What is missing?	7
6.1 Economic Advisory Group	7
6.2 Stakeholder Workshops	7
6.2.1 Detroit	7
6.2.2 Marquette	7
6.2.3 Grand Rapids	8
6.2.4 Grayling	9
Chapter 7. Common Themes: What is Missing?	10
7.1 Financing/Funding	10
7.2 Freight	10
7.3 Innovation/Research	10
7.4 Land Use	10

7.5 Multi-modal/Integration	11
Chapter 8. Bolder Vision	11
8.1 Economic Advisory Group	11
8.2 Stakeholder Workshops	12
8.2.1 Detroit.....	12
8.2.2 Marquette.....	12
8.2.3 Grand Rapids	13
8.2.4 Grayling	13
Chapter 9. Common Themes: Bolder Vision	14
9.1 Financing/Funding.....	14
9.2 Freight.....	15
9.3 Innovation/Research.....	15
9.4 Land Use.....	15
9.5 Multi-Modal/Integration	16
9.6 Findings	16

Appendices

Appendix A: Participants.....	A-1
Appendix B: Stakeholder Workshops Agenda - Round Two - June 2006.....	B-1

Chapter 1. Overview

The Michigan Long-Range Transportation Plan (*MI Transportation Plan*) sought the involvement of stakeholders through an initial set of three meetings, held in Lansing, Escanaba, and Detroit on March 8, 9, and 10, 2006, respectively. These meetings were the first of three scheduled for the stakeholder groups. The initial session was designed to solicit advice and input on the nature of a long-range vision for transportation in Michigan, as well as to acquaint the stakeholders with the general purposes and design of the long-range planning project.

In the first round of meetings, ideas were developed. These stakeholder meetings, along with input received during the first meeting of the Economic Advisory Group (EAG) and the Public Open Houses, provided the information used to develop the Draft *2030 Preferred Public Vision* for *MI Transportation Plan*. This draft vision was mailed to the EAG and stakeholders in early June. On June 22, the EAG met to provide feedback on the draft vision and a second round of stakeholder meetings were held June 23, 27, and 28, 2006. During each of these meetings, the EAG and the stakeholders were asked what they liked, what they did not like, and what is missing from the draft *2030 Preferred Public Vision*. In addition, everyone was asked what could make the vision bolder. Final meetings of the EAG and stakeholders, which are scheduled for November 2006, will provide them with the opportunity to review and discuss the findings of the first draft of the plan. A list of invitees for each round two meeting can be found in **Appendix A**.

This second round of meetings had two primary purposes:

1. To provide an opportunity for stakeholders to review the draft *2030 Preferred Public Vision*; and
2. To provide feedback to MDOT and the consultant team on whether or not the draft *2030 Preferred Public Vision* is an accurate reflection of the public's vision for future transportation in the state.

A brief opening presentation provided the attendees with an update on the development of the plan and the results from round one of the stakeholder involvement. Susan Gorksi, Project Manager for the *MI Transportation Plan*, opened the meetings and reviewed the purpose and agenda. Paul Hershkowitz, Project Manager from Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA), reviewed the overall plan development process and status. In addition, he provided information on the purpose and products from the visioning process. He indicated that one of the most important aspects of the visioning process is that it is the backbone for all future work on *MI Transportation Plan*. The outcome from the visioning process will be the "Preferred Vision for an Integrated Transportation System." Maggie Campbell Jackson, the consultant lead for public and stakeholder involvement, then reviewed the status of the outreach component of the plan. She provided a brief summary of the results of the first round of EAG and stakeholder workshops, and public open houses. This summary included a list of the key attributes of the future transportation system:

- Greater mode choice;
- Better incorporation of freight movement into the existing transportation system;
- Transfers between modes;
- Greater availability of intercity transportation;
- Energy efficient and environmentally friendly; and
- Safe.

A summary of the key features of that future system include:

- Improved preservation and maintenance of roadways and infrastructure;
- Better integration of land use and transportation;
- Reliable, effective, and seamless transit systems;
- Modal connections at airports; and
- Promotion of regional and state non-motorized trails and facilities.

Following these brief presentations, the discussion began with participants in small groups of six to eight people. Results of each of the round two workshops are presented below. This summary is organized by the four questions that were asked in each meeting:

1. What works in the draft *2030 Preferred Public Vision*?
2. What does not work?
3. What is missing?
4. What would make this vision bolder?

Results are summarized so that each of the stakeholder workshops can be compared. The workshop agenda, which was the same for each group, can be found in **Appendix B**.

Across all regions and questions, five common themes emerged:

1. Financing/Funding;
2. Freight; Innovation/Research;
3. Land Use; and
4. Multi-modal/Integration.

Therefore, the summary for each question also includes the relevant responses organized by these five.

Chapter 2. What works?

This discussion provided a chance for the EAG and stakeholders to note the aspects of the draft Preferred Public Vision that accurately reflected their point of view. The discussion question was “what part of the 2030 *Preferred Public Vision* works?” The primary purpose of this question was to provide feedback to the department and the consultants on the portions of the vision that are correct. All discussion feedback from each session is shown below in bulleted form, and is followed by a section on common themes.

2.1 Economic Advisory Group

- New sources of dedicated financing;
- New sources for new vision;
- Innovation—emphasis on smart systems and ITS;
- Separate freight and passenger, manage this mix; and
- Focus on huge number of system-related needs (i.e. maintain, improve current highway system).

2.2 Stakeholder Meetings

2.2.1 Detroit

- Focus on people, not roads;
- Reinforces maintaining what we have;
- CSS focus;
- Attributes and features very inclusive;
- Land use is addressed prominently;
- Recognition of linkages between jurisdictions;
- Innovative transit;
- Prominence of multi-modal;
- Finance user fees;
 - Public and industry recognize too;
- Safety for pedestrians;
 - Crash avoidance by using alternative modes;
- Choices/connectivity;
 - Transit;

- Freight;
- Innovation;
- Sustainability;
- Affordable to all;
- Inclusive and comprehensive;
- Progressive;
- Addresses non-motorized (bike);
- Transit addressed;
- Tourism and visitor friendly;
- Additional user fees;
- Safety;
- Design roads for long life-cycles;
- Economics an important link to transporting people to/from jobs
- User-friendly transit with integration to other modes of travel; and
- Focus moving people and good instead of just people/cars.

2.2.2 Marquette

- Most of the environmental protection as a priority is good;
- Emphasis on transit;
- Corridor/multi-modal/flexible/adaptable approach;
 - Example—if rail goes away how will we move logs/timber?
- Non-motorized emphasis as economic engine (connecting all cities with trail system); and
- Integrated, cost-efficient approach.

2.2.3 Grand Rapids

- Conditions/performance with added emphasis on asset management;
- Transit seen as a first option;
- Finance reference;
- Transit, choices and maintenance a priority
- Reliable/affordable to all;
- Freight is regionalized;

- Land use is considered;
- Reference to integrated transportation systems;
- Reference to ports and airports for economic development;
- Freight separate or better integration;
- Emphasis on non-motorized;
- Intercity transportation (intercommunity);
- Available funding for all;
 - Don't want to lower expectation to meet funding, provide funding to meet expectations;
- Maintenance of conditions/performance but needs to be all modes—not just road, need parity;
 - Implied assumption that everyone has ability to drive;
 - Not maintaining the port capacity now;
- Use of water ferries—both passenger and freight—keep this as an option; and
- Borders—keep freight and people moving.

2.2.4 Grayling

- Cover all transportation (water missing);
- Nicely captured trends;
- Recognition that population is aging; and
 - People's vision is deteriorating and this plan will accommodate that.

Chapter 3. Common Themes: What works?

3.1 Funding/Financing

- New sources of dedicated financing: new sources for new vision;
- Finance-user fees;
- Additional user fees;
- Finance reference; and
- Available funding for all: Don't want to lower expectation to meet funding, provide funding to meet expectations.

3.2 Freight

- Separate freight and passenger, manage this mix;
- Freight is regionalized;
- Freight separate or better integration; and
- Borders—keep freight and people moving.

3.3 Innovation/Research

- Innovation—emphasis on smart systems and ITS; and
- Innovation.

3.4 Land Use

- Land use is addressed prominently; and
- Land use is considered.

3.5 Multi-modal/Integration

- Prominence of multi-modal;
- Choices/connectivity;
 - Transit;
 - Freight;
- Address non-motorized (bike);
- Transit addressed;
- User friendly transit with integration to other modes of travel;
- Focus moving people and good instead of just people/cars;
- Emphasis on transit;
- Integrated cost-efficient approach;
- Transit seen as a first option;
- Transit, choices and maintenance a priority;
- Reference to integrated transportation systems; and
- Emphasis on non-motorized.

Chapter 4. What does not work?

The EAG and stakeholders were provided the opportunity to provide feedback on aspects of the draft *2030 Preferred Public Vision* that did not reflect their views of the future transportation system Michigan needs. The question for this discussion was “what aspects of the vision do not work?” The purpose of this discussion was to provide feedback on what concepts or components of the *2030 Preferred Public Vision* should be reconsidered. Again, the feedback below represents the full discussion from each of the sessions in bulleted form, followed by a section on common themes.

4.1 Economic Advisory Group

- Lack of information about operations;
- Not enough emphasis on safety; and
- Unmet needs may be under emphasized.

4.2 Stakeholder Workshops

4.2.1 Detroit

- Eliminating option of increased taxes;
- Transit defined generally instead of rail, commuter rail, etc.;
- No data-tech report info would have been helpful;
- Economics performance (attributes) not complete enough;
- Land use—bottom up—Appropriate role for state and regional;
- Snow mobiles shouldn’t be included in non-motorized;
- Difficulty of integrating freight and passenger on railroads is under stressed;
- Not enough emphasis on leadership;
- Absence of asset management approach—using available resources to grow;
- Politics hijacking the plan;
- Freight too vague—need better definition;
- Freight to rail---problems;
 - Rail-private—may want to look at better collaboration or build public rail lines; and
- Non-motorized access—MDOT should not be involved in this mode--Not part of this plan—other entity involvement.

4.2.2 Marquette

- Funding goes where the population is and UP has very low density. In UP we are marketing tourism as Playground of the North.
- Revenue is sales tax based so we cannot support a sustainable plan/system.
- Plan needs to better define transportation needs to support regional and local plans;
 - Tourism, economic development.
- Plan needs to recognize economic nodes.
- Border freight security right now/need improved controls to make it more secure.
- No interconnectivity in transit systems;
 - No regional coordinated approach.
- Not thinking about fuel situation;
 - Infrastructure meaningless if can't afford gas;
 - Michigan should be leader in fuel technology.
- Use of word "sprawl" not applicable in UP.
- Land fragmentation/access points/safety need better planning.

4.2.3 Grand Rapids

- Needs stronger, bolder language on land use;
- Balance between transit with the aging population: Multi-modal and community use—transit shouldn't be seen as second class;
- Strong justification of expanding road network;
- Managing growth patterns instead of managing sprawl;
- Limiting aviation to the UP;
- New technology (smart systems) innovation should be a separate domain;
- Alternative energy needs to be addressed;
- Lacking financial details;
- Too much emphasis on highway capacity;
- No emphasis on getting freight off highway to rail;
- Tie safety to congestion;
- High speed rail at 200 mph is too limited;
- Communication is not included;
- Land use/transportation link is not clear;

- What are subsurface issues in environment?
- “Sprawl is managed”—sprawl means different things—has a suburban bias;
- Working on the assumption that fuel will be cheap/abundant—what about \$10/gal fuel?
- Public transportation aimed at older population—need it to be first class, not second class—for everyone; and
- Loose terminology of seamless—need for everyone to access, especially intercity bus and trains for access and mobility.

4.2.4 Grayling

- Don’t understand secure.
 - Understand borders but what about Traverse City? Don’t understand how it applies and it will drive up costs; and
 - Make sure it is tailored to the area—one size does not fit all.

Chapter 5. Common Themes: What does not work?

5.1 Funding/Financing

- Eliminating option of increased taxes;
- Revenue is sales tax based so we cannot support a sustainable plan/system; and
- Lacking financial details.

5.2 Freight

- Freight too vague—need better definition;
- Freight to rail---problems;
 - Rail-private—may want to look at better collaboration or build public rail lines; and
- No emphasis on getting freight off highway to rail.

5.3 Innovation/Research

- New technology (smart systems) innovation should be a separate domain.

5.4 Land Use

- Land use—bottom up: appropriate role for state and regional;
- Land fragmentation/access points/safety need better planning;

- Needs stronger, bolder language on land use;
- Managing growth patterns instead of managing sprawl; and
- Land use/transportation link is not clear.

5.5 Multi-modal/Integration

- Non-motorized access—MDOT should not be involved in this mode – Not part of this plan—other entity involvement;
- No interconnectivity in transit systems;
- Balance between transit with the aging population: Multi-modal and community use—transit shouldn't be seen as second class;
- High speed rail at 200 mph is too limited; and
- Public transportation aimed at older population—need it to be first class, not second-class—for everyone.

Chapter 6. What is missing?

In the third round of discussions, the participants were asked what is missing from the draft *2030 Preferred Public Vision*. The purpose of this question is to provide input on potential additions to the vision. Again, the documentation below reflects the full discussion of each of the groups in bulleted format, followed by a section on common themes.

6.1 Economic Advisory Group

- Airports critical role;
- Urban centers more livable in terms of transportation, walking, etc.;
- Attention paid to alternative means to finance alternative modes, such as grants, or other financing methods;
- Sense of priorities over time, e.g. opportunities for rail for passenger or freight based on the broad vision;
- Context sensitive solutions;
- Bus systems for inter and intracity transport? Agree on choices as an outcome; and
- Security air, transit, rail (post-Madrid).

6.2 Stakeholder Workshops

6.2.1 Detroit

- Non-motorized choice is provided at the local level;
- Transportation demand management—travel choices provided by employers;
- On-going public involvement—starts at beginning of plan/project;
 - Information/Education;
 - Having public understand how things work;
 - Data to inform policy decisions;
 - Value of how personal decisions impacting transportation system (where they live, work, shop, etc.), i.e. land use;
- Coordination among agencies, jurisdictions at all levels;
- Safety- broader definition;
 - Personal safety on all modes;
- Smart systems beyond auto;
 - For transit, freight;
 - If Michigan is a leader it leads to economic development;
- Land use transportation link;
- Freight;
 - Cross border—make sure it is in security to make it seamless;
 - Supply chain assessment to see the way forward—how Michigan fits in;
- Communication and coordination—capture the Super Bowl experience;
 - More efficient and expanded operations through ITS;
- Longer design life for pavements (European model); and
- Politically more inclusive.

6.2.2 Marquette

- Strategies to become globally competitive;
- Educating the public on the vision – then concepts, initiatives, investments;
 - what a gas tax increase can do;
 - tell people what they are getting for their taxes;
 - 90 percent of the roads are county/local;

- 10 percent are MDOT and in good shape; 80-90 percent VMT on state roads;
- MDOT Statewide Educational campaign;
- Focus on tourism – in UP 187,000 hotel rooms last year; 20,000 stopped at visitor centers;
 - Tourism one of the few industries in the state that won't pick up and go to India;
- More interstate coordination and regional strategies;
- Transit interconnectivity and rural service;
- Multi-modal transportation commitment – needs state leadership;
 - Is MDOT going to be viewed as a leader?
- Incentive for trucking to be more efficient especially with backhaul;
- Education component---options/impacts;
- Emphasis on shipping—keeping ports as an option;
- Asset management—focus on preserving/maintaining what you have already invested in; and
- Ensure that design can support long-range uses--reflected in corridor approach.

6.2.3 Grand Rapids

- Incorporation of CSS;
- Regionalization of airport system;
- Non-traditional innovative financing;
- Intergovernmental cooperation;
- Buses added to intercity passenger to cover shorter distances;
- Business and residents value multi-modal transport;
- Under safety, should include bicyclists;
- Evaluation/assessment component;
 - Pre-project/Post system;
- ITS (intelligent transportation systems)—more emphasis on technology for transport solutions;
- Safety definition per SAFETEA-LU (not just congestion);
- Communication as a domain;
 - Traveler information;
 - To the public on transportation options;
 - Common transportation terminology;

- Links between modes;
- Elderly mobility;
- Land use as a key feature/domain;
- Add air quality to environment;
- State more involved in land use policy;
- Include rail with freight features;
- Partnering with technology;
- Option for separating people/freight at borders;
- Hard look at financing options—that funds will be there;
- Land use—lack of recognition that all communities don’t have plans;
- MDOT responsibility for non-motorized along all/across facilities;
- Idea of sharing/integrated intercity/intercommunity passenger;
- State/MDOT commitment to funding vision-“idea that it is investment instead of a subsidy”;
- Full compliance with ADA and use of best practices—barrier free for all; and
- Open honesty/public education on what can do.

6.2.4 Grayling

- Political process;
- Water transportation (or ice for several months);
- Local politics/land use biggest hurdle to overcome—one township wants economic development; adjacent one doesn’t;
- Innovative design, new materials;
- State does not have innovation for disabled that other states have now;
 - Accessibility for everyone all the time;
 - County lines are a barrier to transit—needs to be fixed;
- Need innovation—Michigan should be a technology leader for all modes;
- Public transit should be seamless—with invisible boundaries;
 - Reliable, timely, convenient;
 - “We will be successful when public transportation is not a choice of desperation”;
- Did not just find out that aging population is a real force in what we will be and what we need to look at;

- Need to breakdown barriers between agencies;
- Need land use/gas tax reform since asking people not to drive;
- Need economic development push—needs to be understood;
- Equity for rural transportation—not there now and we need it; and
- Needs regulations to provide incentives/disincentives to reach vision (such as regional cooperation with transit).

Chapter 7. Common Themes: What is Missing?

7.1 Financing/Funding

- Attention paid to alternative means to finance alternative modes, such as grants, or other financing methods;
- Non-traditional innovative financing;
- Hard look at financing options—that funds will be there; and
- State/MDOT commitment to funding vision.

7.2 Freight

- Freight Cross border—make sure it is in security to make it seamless;
- Incentive for trucking to be more efficient especially with backhaul;
- Emphasis on shipping—keeping ports as an option; and
- Option for separating people/freight at borders.

7.3 Innovation/Research

- Smart systems beyond auto-for transit, freight;
- ITS (intelligent transportation systems)—more emphasis on technology for transport solutions;
- Innovative design, new materials;
- State does not have innovation for disabled that other states have now; and
- Need innovation—Michigan should be a technology leader for all modes.

7.4 Land Use

- Land use transportation link;

- Land use as a key feature/domain;
- State more involved in land use policy;
- Land use—lack of recognition that all communities don't have plans; and
- Local politics/land use biggest hurdle to overcome—one township wants economic development; adjacent one doesn't.

7.5 Multi-modal/Integration

- Bus systems for inter and intracity transport? Agree on choices as an outcome;
- Non-motorized choice is provided at the local level;
- Transit interconnectivity and rural service;
- Multi-modal transportation commitment – needs state leadership;
 - Is MDOT going to be viewed as a leader?
- Buses added to intercity passenger to cover shorter distances;
- Business and residents value multi-modal transport;
- MDOT responsibility for non-motorized along all/across facilities;
- Idea of sharing/integrated intercity/intercommunity passenger;
- County lines are a barrier to transit—needs to be fixed;
- Public transit should be seamless—with invisible boundaries;
 - Reliable, timely, convenient; and
 - “We will be successful when public transportation is not a choice of desperation.”

Chapter 8. Bolder Vision

Finally, the EAG and stakeholders were asked what could make the draft vision bolder. The purpose of this question was to press these participants to think beyond the problems and issues of today and to consider what the state will need from its transportation system well into the 21st century. Again, the documentation below reflects the full discussion of each of the groups in bulleted format, followed by a section on common themes.

8.1 Economic Advisory Group

- Finding new partners to do more;
- Focus on research and technology leadership;

8.2 Stakeholder Workshops

8.2.1 Detroit

- Land use—needs MDOT leadership;
- Transit funding—need to fund it differently;
- Need a new paradigm on citizens thinking on land use and its impacts;
- On-going education of public;
- Linking overall transportation improvement to economic impact—allows thinking outside the box;
- Innovation and research;
 - Focus apply at the corridor level—pilot projects;
- Make sure it is comprehensive, all inclusive modes, balanced with non-motorized;
- Reducing the demand for transportation—less trips, less VMT;
- Access to information, telecommuting;
- New legislation for more funding options;
- Autobahn approach for certain roadways;
 - Downside—may increase sprawl;
- Educating the public on use of new modes of travel (media, PR approaches) and support for funding;
- Funding-dedicated source, long-term;
- Quality (sustainable) roads over quantity—reduce road impacts;
- Do we need all roads for their intended use into the future?
- Do we need county/state system—governance question; and
- Freight/rail – public system or new governance.

8.2.2 Marquette

- New entities – lead by region;
- New funding formula by region;
- Regional autonomy with statewide efficiencies – “regional czars” – can address UP capacity and infrastructure;
- Strategic alliances with Universities to enhance research and innovation – implement on a regional basis;
- How do you create a bold vision not knowing what the future will bring?

- How do we measure? How do we keep score?
- Consider legislative agenda/thinking innovative bills, if necessary, to get it done;
 - Support from all levels – building partnerships;
- Include technology industry – fuel, engines, vehicles;
- Keep it independent of politics; and
- Something about funding – proactive not just filling the gaps but having more than adequate funding.

8.2.3 *Grand Rapids*

- Language overall needs to be bolder, but how do you get bold without slipping into fantasy;
- Fundamental vision is what kind of community do we want (i.e. land use vision), then we can develop the transportation vision to serve that community vision (land use and transportation must be coordinated, but land use first);
- Vision must benchmark annual decisions;
- Impact fees for development outside of service area as part of financing domain;
- Provide multi-modal systems to the majority of new developments;
- Develop innovative financing techniques;
- Proactively pursue and prioritize functional multi-modal system statewide;
- All of the following are needed to be able to “live the vision”;
 - State assumptions for plan---maybe have alternative futures;
 - Take vision and show how it becomes a reality, needs to be real for people, i.e. next steps;
 - Tie to implementation with 5-year plans—need to make sure vision gets reflected immediately;
 - Reflect that transportation equals investment...it drives the economy; and
 - Focus on funding/financing for all modes.

8.2.4 *Grayling*

Three things need to be changed about land use:

- Need to get rid of township form of government;
- Need statewide zoning;
- Regionalism;
- Locals need to support to develop quality local plan;

- Summary;
 - Land use decision-making needs to be less fragmented;
 - Concern about sprawl;
 - Has to be more long-term (doesn't change when politicians change);
 - Overlay of local/regional (tailored to part of state you are in);
- Looking back from 2030 public transportation is as easy to use as any other mode;
- Innovative financing needs to be bolder;
 - Take decisions out of politicians hands that are looking for political gain;
 - Need stronger role for partnerships/collaboration;
- MDOT role in future;
 - Leadership, education, guidance;
 - Help get out of the mindset of being a car state;
 - Doing things together;
- Protect rail corridors—don't sell it off;
- MDOT needs to stop mortgaging our future;
- Get semis off highway---separate systems; and
- Think about needs of "zoomers"---boomers who keep on working.

Chapter 9. Common Themes: Bolder Vision

9.1 Financing/Funding

- Transit funding—need to fund it differently;
- New legislation for more funding options;
- Funding-dedicated source, long-term;
- Develop innovative financing techniques;
- Focus on funding/financing for all modes;
- Innovative financing needs to be bolder;
 - Take decisions out of politicians hands that are looking for political gain;
 - Need stronger role for partnerships/collaboration;
- MDOT needs to stop mortgaging our future;

- Something about funding—pro-active not just filling the gaps but having more than adequate funding; and
- Impact fees for development outside of service area as part of financing domain.

9.2 Freight

- Freight rail-public system or new governance; and
- Get semis off highway---separate systems.

9.3 Innovation/Research

- Focus on research and technology leadership;
- Innovation and research;
 - Focus apply at the corridor level—pilot project;
- Strategic alliances with Universities to enhance research and innovation – implement on a regional basis; and
- Include technology industry—fuel, engines, vehicles.

9.4 Land Use

- Land use—needs MDOT leadership;
- Need a new paradigm on citizens thinking on land use and its impacts;
- Fundamental vision is what kind of community do we want (i.e. land use vision), then we can develop the transportation vision to serve that community vision (land use and transportation must be coordinated, but land use first);
- Three things need to be changed about land use:
 - Need to get rid of township form of government;
 - Need statewide zoning; and
 - Regionalism.
- Locals need to support to develop quality local plan;
- Summary;
 - Land use decision-making needs to be less fragmented;
 - Concern about sprawl;
 - Has to be more long-term (doesn't change when politicians change); and
 - Overlay of local/regional (tailored to part of state you are in).

9.5 Multi-modal/Integration

- Make sure it is comprehensive, all inclusive modes, balanced with non-motorized;
- Provide multi-modal systems to the majority of new developments; and
- Proactively pursue and prioritize functional multi-modal system statewide.

9.6 Findings

Reviewing the results from all of the meetings and all of the questions, there are five frequently discussed topics that emerge. The participants' comments across all the questions had a consistent message for each of these themes.

Financing/Funding: The plan needs to include new, innovative sources of dedicated, long-term funding to support all modes of transportation.

Freight: Freight and freight facilities (ports, airports, and rail) need to be included in the plan, but there needs to be some separation of freight and passenger travel regardless of the mode (road, rail, at the borders).

Innovation/Research: Michigan needs innovative solutions to its transportation problems and the state should partner and/or support research to encourage this innovation.

Land Use: The land use/transportation connection is critical to improving the state's transportation system. The state and MDOT should take a leadership role in understanding and improving this connection.

Multi-modal/Integration: The state needs a comprehensive, integrated multi-modal transportation system. Program implementation and funding should reflect this goal.

For each four-discussion questions, there were additional themes that did not cut across all the questions. For the question of "What Works," the vision's focus on preservation and asset management was well received by the participants. In addition, safety, the importance of transportation to the state's economy, and affordability of the transportation system to all were discussed in several groups.


The questions of "What Does Not Work" and "What is Missing" from the vision are closely related and there were several issues that cut across these two questions. The vision's lack of explicit support for operational solutions, particularly the use of technology (such as ITS) as a priority solution was one of the most common. Also, the lack of any discussion on the price of gas or the need for alternative fuels was raised in several groups. Another issue that several of the groups discussed at length is the need for MDOT to take a leadership role in educating the public about mode choice, transportation financing, and the role of individual decisions in the overall functioning of the transportation system. Finally, the issue of interjurisdictional cooperation or the need for a stronger partnership between local jurisdictions and between state and local government was discussed in both these sections and in the questions on making the vision bolder.

The question of making the vision bolder caught the attention of the stakeholders and input for this question was extensive. This question provided the participants the opportunity to reinforce their discussions from the “What Does Not Work” or “What is Missing” discussions. The five common themes are strongly reinforced with both general comments and specific ideas for making the vision bolder. Specific to this question the participants emphasized that the vision needs to be stronger, more visionary. Leadership was discussed in many groups. Participants talked about MDOT as a leader for transportation in the state, and Michigan as a leader for transportation in the nation. This theme is particularly strong around technology and innovation. The EAG, for example, recognized that Michigan’s automotive industrial base provides a competitive advantage to be a leader in national, perhaps global, transportation innovation. This question also provided the participants with the opportunity to voice their concerns about implementation of the plan overall. They expressed concerns about the role of politics in transportation decision-making. Several groups discussed the need to tie the plan to shorter-term planning and include measures or progress reports as feedback on the implementation.


In summary, results from the EAG and stakeholder meeting provide substantial feedback on the public’s vision for Michigan’s future transportation system. This information will be used to create the final *2030 Preferred Public Vision*, one the primary inputs into the development of *MI Transportation Plan*.

Appendix A: Participants

Economic Advisory Group


 MI Transportation Plan Economic Advisory Group Meeting - June 22, 2006			
Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
Sarah Fink MHA	110 W Michigan Ave Lansing MI	517 703 8626	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
A. V. MARSTON MI LEAGUE FOR HUMAN SERVICES	1115 S. PENNSYLVANIA, STE 202 LANSING MI 48912	517-487-5436 FAX 517-371-4546 amarston@MICHLEAGUEFORHUMANSVS.ORG	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
MELINDA REMER TAMUL MICHIGAN THEODOR KELLEY	300 N WASHINGTON SQ LANSING, MI 48840 MDOT	517/373-1531 REMER.M@MICHIGAN.GOV 517-373 2110	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
KEN ROEMER	Automation Alley	248.457.3200	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Detroit



MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 23, 2006 - Detroit


Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
Jacqueline White Detroit Workforce Development Dept	707 W. Milwaukee	876-0584 x218	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Bob Adcock Angelo Infante Const	24305 Shawwood Warren #1 48091	587-756-1070 badcock2@aol.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Megan Owens Transitnation Riders United	500 Griswold Ste 1650 Detroit	313 963 8872 mowens@detroittransit.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
SUE PILON DOWNRIVER COMMUNITY CONFERENCE	15100 Northline Southgate, MI 48195	734 362 3425 734 281 0265 SUE.PILON@downr.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Eli Cooper City of Ann Arbor	100 N. 5th Ave Ann Arbor, MI 48107	734-996-3026 734 94-1744 ECOOPER@CITY-ANN-ARBOR.MI.US	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

 MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 23, 2006 - Detroit			
Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
KEVIN TROUP	1515 E 11 Mile Rd Royal Oak MI 48067	248 547 4431 ext 202 KEVIN.TROUP@ssa.gov	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Tim TLo663.com	1301 E WATZLER AVE DDOT - LHM Div DETROIT MI 48202	313/853-1126 tim.tlo663@dot.state.mi.us	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
GERALD ROWE	535 CRISWOLD, SUITE 310 DETROIT, MI 48206	313-961-4266 (W) 313-961-4269 (CF) rowe@semdot.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Tommy Meabows			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Charles Stedman	19833 TIREMAN DETROIT, MI 48228 313-441-4522		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No





MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 23, 2006 - Detroit

Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
BEN SCUPA / MEE	119 PERE MARQUETTE LANSING	(577) 487-5537 / BENMEE@MEE.ORG	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
SEAN KELLEY	2365 HAGGERTY CANTON	734.397.3100 SKELLEY@MANNIKSMITHGROUP.COM	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
PAUL JOHNSON	19251 NACK AVE., Suite 525 Detroit, Michigan 48236	(313) 886-8275 (ext. 224) JOHNSONP1@MICHIGAN.GOV	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Karen Putnam	Lansing m & d	517/335-1858 putnamk@michigan.org	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Ken Wells	6211 Taylor Dr. Flint, MI 48507	810-341-7500 kwells@rowencorp.com	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Mike Whims	1914 Ludgouis Royal Oak, MI 48067	248 892 4545 mwhims@wowway.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Ryan Simmons	125 E. 2nd St Monroe, MI 48162	734 240 7382 ryan-simmons@maoverni.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No


 MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 23, 2006 - Detroit			
Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
Royce MANIKO Monroe County Planner	125 EAST 2ND ST MONROE, MI 48661	734-240-7380 734-240-7385 royce_maniako@monroecounty.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Jennifer EVANS SEMCOG	535 Griswold #300 DET 48226	313-324-3200 313-961-4869 evans@semcog.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Kimberly Avery MDOT	25185 Goddard Taylor, MI 48180	313-375-2401 313-295-0822 averyk@michigan.gov	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Tracy Litchow DWEJ	4750 Woodward #406 DET MI 48201	313-833-3935 313-833-3955 F	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
STEPHANIE J. TAYLOR SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNER SEMCOG	535 GRISWOLD, SUITE 300 DETROIT, MI 48226	(313) 324-3330 (F) (313) 961-4869 (F) taylor@semcog.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No


Marquette


 MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 26, 2006 - Marquette			
Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
Gerald Peterson City of Marquette	100 Silver St Marquette, MI 49846	(906) 475-7700 x111	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Vince Bevins MDOT	1318 3rd Ave S.	(906) 786-1800	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
RANDY VANBORTFLEET MDOT	"	"	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
MARK MALONEY MDOT	"	"	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

 MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 26, 2006 - Marquette			
Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
David F. Sletzer	650 A Ave	906-346-0208 (office)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Pottawac Forest Products Corp.	6WINA, MI 49841	906-346-9458 (fax) DAVE.SLETZER@POTLATCH.COM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
DICKI WHITE	200 INDUSTRY PARK RD	906-884-2004 office and fax	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
ONTONAGON CO. TRANSIT	ONTONAGON MI 49953	ontran@iamadots.com	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Pat Black	337 W. Washington	906-228-7749 228-3642 director@marquettecounty.org	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No
JOHN F. MARSHALL	19 MIDDLE ISLAND PT MARQUETTE, MI 49855	906-228-5279 VICE CHAIR LAKE SUPERIOR COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
DAVE PALMER	100 SILVER ST NEGAUNEE MI 49866	906-475-7700 x 13	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No
Thyra Karlstrom	2415 14th Ave S ESCANABA, MI 49829	906-786-9234 Fax 906-786-4442	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No
Henry De Groot	72463 CR 426 North 1/2nd, MI 49831	906-238-4251	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No


Grand Rapids


 MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 27, 2006 - Grand Rapids			
Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
Steve Stepak West MI Regional Planning Comm	820 Monroe St NW Suite 214 Grand Rapids 49503	616-774-8400	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Todd Sydnor City of Holland Transp. Services	333 Wyngarden Way Holland MI 49423	616/928-2400	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Abigail EATON MI Dept. of Agriculture	PO Box 30017 Lansing, MI 48909	517-241-3933	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
RAND BOWMAN SMPC	POB 2137 PORTAGE MI 49081	269 323 0045	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Robert HAYNES Conley Island	4557 Abby Lane Wyoming MI 49418	616-530-3418 rjhaynes@voyager.net	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Tom Cady WMERC	1007 Lake Dr. Grand Rapids, MI 49506	616-451-3051 tcady@wmrc.org	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

 MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 27, 2006 - Grand Rapids			
Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
JACK FEET AAA MICHIGAN	1 AUTO CLUB DR DEARBORN	616 467-8327 JCFEET@AAA MICHIGAN.COM	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
KENT RUBLEY Grand County Road Comm	70 Box 738 Grand Haven MI 49417	616 850-7204 KRUBLEY@OTTAWACORE.COM	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Phil Reid DLZ Friends of Transit of Kalamazoo Co.	1524 Dogwood Dr Portage MI 49024	hab.fdr@charter.net 269-441-0503	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Jenn Reidsma URS	3950 Sparks Drive Grand Rapids 49546	616-574-8367 jennifer_reidsma@urscorp.com	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Steve Redman OBEO ITANI / GVMC	40 Pearl N.W Suite 410 G.R. MI 49503	616-776-7606 clawia@gvmc.org	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
David Bertram	MI Townships Assn 512 Westshire Drive Lansing MI 48917	517-321-4467 david@michigantownships.org	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Tom Hall	Mich Office of Service 10th story, 1109 W. Saginaw, Lansing	HALLTAMEL@michigan.gov 517-373-8641	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

 MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 27, 2006 - Grand Rapids			
Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
Dave Bee West MI Regional Planning Commission	820 Monroe NW #214 GR 49503	616 774 8900 774 0808 dbee@wmrps	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Barb Slope DAEC	4254 Oak Forest Dr Kentwood MI 49545	stoggsbarbara@aol.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
RICK DERRIES CITY OF GR	300 MONROE NW GR 49503	rderries@ci.grand-rapids.mi.us	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
BRAD GAMMON MICHIGAN ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL	119 Rose Maryette Suite 2A LANSING MI 48912	bradmecevoyager.net	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Andrea Brown MI Association of Planners	219 S. Main, St 300 Ann Arbor 48103	734.913.2000 abrown@planningmi.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
KAREN BACHMAN WATS	705 N. Zeeb ANN ARBOR, 48103	734-994-3127 blackforest@mi.wats.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Dave Bulkowski	Disability Advocates 3600 Camelot SE GR 49546	616-949-4400 x.228 dave.b@data.us	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Grayling

 MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 28, 2006 - Grayling			
Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
Elizabeth White Michigan Commission for the Blind DLEG	125 E. Union, Hwyl. Flint, MI 48502	(810) 760-2030 whitee2@michigan.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
RICHARD C. BAYUS NEMCOG	1527 W. OTTAWA ST. LANSING, MI 48915	810-610-0850 rbayus@comcast.net	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
David Langhorst MDOT	2927 DEM Drive Gaylord, MI	langhorstd@michigan.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Jim Moore Northern MI Alliance for Independent Living	2301 Garfield, Suite A Traverse City MI 49886	231 922 0903 jimmoore@chartermi.net	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Justin Wing MDOT - Grayling ISC	1680 Hartwick Pines Rd Grayling MI 49738	wingju@michigan.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Gail Gilliland CCEDP	PO Box 141 Grayling 49738	gailag@i2k.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Herb Lemcoot	907 Meadow Ln Traverse City, MI 49684	hlemcoot@chmainst.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

 MI Transportation Plan Stakeholder Workshop - June 28, 2006 - Grayling			
Name/Affiliation (Please Print)	Address	Phone/Fax/Email	Would you be willing to help us distribute project information via Email?
Candice Lee DeBj MRS	Enterprise Dr. - Mt Pleasant	lecc@umich.edu	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Wayne Koppa	P.O. Box 375 Grayling, MI 49735	wkoppa@hokweil.com	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

**Appendix B: Stakeholder Workshops Agenda
Round Two - June 2006**



MDOT Stakeholder Workshop
SEMCOG
535 Griswold Street, Suite 300,
Detroit, MI
June 23, 2006
9:00 AM to Noon

Primary Workshop Purposes

1. Review the status of the Michigan Long Range Transportation Plan process
2. Review the status of the public involvement process
3. Provide comments on the draft Preferred Public Vision Report

AGENDA

- 9:00 AM **Welcome, Introductions and Review of Project:** Susan Gorski/Paul Hershkowitz
Objective: Welcome and reintroduce everyone, reminder of the purpose/charge and brief overview of the status of the planning process
Process: PowerPoint presentation of MI Transportation Plan status with question and answer discussion
Product: Understanding the MI Transportation Plan process and the role of the stakeholders in developing the plan
- 9:30 AM **Review of Participation Process:** Maggie Campbell Jackson
Objective: Review participation process status, overall summary messages of what we have heard from Round 1, and overview of the draft Preferred Public Vision
Process: Presentation with question and answer discussion
Product: Understanding of the status of the participation process and how stakeholder participation relates to other inputs
Materials: Cross Tabulation of Public Input on Long Range Vision for Transportation: Attributes and Features
- 10:00 AM **Break**
- 10:15 AM **Review of Draft Preferred Public Vision Report:** Janet D'Ignazio
Objective: Generate comments, issues, concerns about the draft Preferred Public Vision
Process: Brief overview presentation and discussion (breakout groups) with input captured on flip charts
Questions: What elements of the draft Preferred Public Vision work?
What elements did not work?
What is missing from this vision?
What would make this vision bolder?
Product: Stakeholder feedback on draft Public Preferred Vision
- 11:30 AM **Next Steps:** Susan Gorski/Paul Hershkowitz
Objective: Identify next steps, answer questions.
Process: Describe steps in project and next steps for the stakeholders.
- 12:00 Noon **Adjourn**

MDOT State Long-Range Transportation Plan Economic Advisory Group &
Stakeholder
Workshops Meeting Summary



MDOT Stakeholder Workshop
Peter White Public Library
217 North Front Street, Marquette, MI
June 26, 2006
9:00 AM to Noon

Primary Workshop Purposes

1. Review the status of the Michigan Long Range Transportation Plan process
2. Review the status of the public involvement process
3. Provide comments on the draft Preferred Public Vision Report

AGENDA

- 9:00 AM **Welcome, Introductions and Review of Project:** Susan Gorski/Paul Hershkowitz
Objective: Welcome and reintroduce everyone, reminder of the purpose/charge and brief overview of the status of the planning process
Process: PowerPoint presentation of MI Transportation Plan status with question and answer discussion
Product: Understanding the MI Transportation Plan process and the role of the stakeholders in developing the plan
- 9:30 AM **Review of Participation Process:** Maggie Campbell Jackson
Objective: Review participation process status, overall summary messages of what we have heard from Round 1, and overview of the draft Preferred Public Vision
Process: Presentation with question and answer discussion
Product: Understanding of the status of the participation process and how stakeholder participation relates to other inputs
Materials: Cross Tabulation of Public Input on Long Range Vision for Transportation: Attributes and Features
- 10:00 AM **Break**
- 10:15 AM **Review of Draft Preferred Public Vision Report:** Janet D'Ignazio
Objective: Generate comments, issues, concerns about the draft Preferred Public Vision
Process: Brief overview presentation and discussion (breakout groups) with input captured on flip charts
Questions: What elements of the draft Preferred Public Vision work?
What elements did not work?
What is missing from this vision?
What would make this vision bolder?
Product: Stakeholder feedback on draft Public Preferred Vision
- 11:30 AM **Next Steps:** Susan Gorski/Paul Hershkowitz
Objective: Identify next steps, answer questions.
Process: Describe steps in project and next steps for the stakeholders.
- 12:00 Noon **Adjourn**

MDOT State Long-Range Transportation Plan Economic Advisory Group &
Stakeholder
Workshops Meeting Summary



MDOT Stakeholder Workshop
Grand Rapids Charter Township
1836 East Beltline NE, Grand Rapids, MI
June 27, 2006
9:00 AM - Noon

Primary Workshop Purposes

1. Review the status of the Michigan Long Range Transportation Plan process
2. Review the status of the public involvement process
3. Provide comments on the draft Preferred Public Vision Report

AGENDA

- 9:00 AM **Welcome, Introductions and Review of Project:** Susan Gorski/Paul Hershkowitz
Objective: Welcome and reintroduce everyone, reminder of the purpose/charge and brief overview of the status of the planning process
Process: PowerPoint presentation of MI Transportation Plan status with question and answer discussion
Product: Understanding the MI Transportation Plan process and the role of the stakeholders in developing the plan
- 9:30 AM **Review of Participation Process:** Maggie Campbell Jackson
Objective: Review participation process status, overall summary messages of what we have heard from Round 1, and overview of the draft Preferred Public Vision
Process: Presentation with question and answer discussion
Product: Understanding of the status of the participation process and how stakeholder participation relates to other inputs
Materials: Cross Tabulation of Public Input on Long Range Vision for Transportation: Attributes and Features
- 10:00 AM **Break**
- 10:15 AM **Review of Draft Preferred Public Vision Report:** Janet D'Ignazio
Objective: Generate comments, issues, concerns about the draft Preferred Public Vision
Process: Brief overview presentation and discussion (breakout groups) with input captured on flip charts
Questions: What elements of the draft Preferred Public Vision work?
What elements did not work?
What is missing from this vision?
What would make this vision bolder?
Product: Stakeholder feedback on draft Public Preferred Vision
- 11:30 AM **Next Steps:** Susan Gorski/Paul Hershkowitz
Objective: Identify next steps, answer questions.
Process: Describe steps in project and next steps for the stakeholders.
- 12:00 Noon **Adjourn**



MDOT Stakeholder Workshop
Devereaux Memorial Crawford
County Library
201 Plum Street, Grayling, MI
June 28, 2006
9:00 AM - Noon

Primary Workshop Purposes

1. Review the status of the Michigan Long Range Transportation Plan process
2. Review the status of the public involvement process
3. Provide comments on the draft Preferred Public Vision Report

AGENDA

- 9:00 AM **Welcome, Introductions and Review of Project:** Susan Gorski/Paul Hershkowitz
Objective: Welcome and reintroduce everyone, reminder of the purpose/charge and brief overview of the status of the planning process
Process: PowerPoint presentation of MI Transportation Plan status with question and answer discussion
Product: Understanding the MI Transportation Plan process and the role of the stakeholders in developing the plan
- 9:30 AM **Review of Participation Process:** Maggie Campbell Jackson
Objective: Review participation process status, overall summary messages of what we have heard from Round 1, and overview of the draft Preferred Public Vision
Process: Presentation with question and answer discussion
Product: Understanding of the status of the participation process and how stakeholder participation relates to other inputs
Materials: Cross Tabulation of Public Input on Long Range Vision for Transportation: Attributes and Features
- 10:00 AM **Break**
- 10:15 AM **Review of Draft Preferred Public Vision Report:** Janet D'Ignazio
Objective: Generate comments, issues, concerns about the draft Preferred Public Vision
Process: Brief overview presentation and discussion (breakout groups) with input captured on flip charts
Questions: What elements of the draft Preferred Public Vision work?
What elements did not work?
What is missing from this vision?
What would make this vision bolder?
Product: Stakeholder feedback on draft Public Preferred Vision
- 11:30 AM **Next Steps:** Susan Gorski/Paul Hershkowitz
Objective: Identify next steps, answer questions.
Process: Describe steps in project and next steps for the stakeholders.
- 12:00 Noon **Adjourn**